

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1 through 33 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims. Independent claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27 have been amended to further define the present invention and to correct the antecedent basis problems pointed out by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5-33 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis. In response to the indefiniteness rejection, Applicants have amended claims 5, 16 and 27 to recite “an address field” rather than “the address field” and amended claims 1, 12 and 23 to recite “a correct addressee” rather than “the correct addressee.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner’s indefiniteness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 A1 to Quine et al. (“Quine”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Present Invention

The present invention teaches a method, system and computer program product for predicting/completing the addressee field in an electronic mail system, in which user-related history information, including the user's sent and/or received mail, is analyzed, using text mining and/or data mining techniques, for associating the most probable addressee for a given e-mail letter.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part:

A computerized method for predicting [[the]] a correct addressee to be filled-in in an addressee field in an e-mail system, whereby user-related history information, including the user's prior sent and/or received e-mail, is analyzed for associating the most probable addressee for an e-mail to be addressed, comprising the steps of:

analyzing at least one of the following attributes of said user-related history information and of said e-mail to be addressed

... whereby Text Mining methods are used to associate attribute values with respective addressees, thus yielding a plurality of single analysis results usable for said prediction, and

weighting the plurality of said single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as a prediction result.

Amended claims 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27 recite similar language.

The present invention uses text mining methods to mine the text of the user's prior sent and/or received e-mail in order to find attribute text that can be associated, using data mining methods, with the individual respective email addresses of the prior email. As recited in claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 23 and 28, the attributes of the prior email which are analyzed include not just the email address, but the subject line, particular vocabulary used, the language used, the topics, as

well as other attributes. Additionally, the present invention gives weightings to the various analyses which are done. Thus, novel aspects of the claimed invention include the use of text mining and data mining methods on several attributes, including the email address as well as several other types of attributes, of the user's prior email and the weighting of the results of the data mining. These aspects of the invention are expressly claimed in each pending claim

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 to Quine et al.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115279 A1 to Quine et al. ("Quine") teaches a method for providing a corrected e-mail address, whereby the domain portion of the e-mail address is parsed and, referring to a domain format rule database, a format rule or requirement corresponding to the domain is identified. In Quine, only a newly sent email from a user is examined and only the email address portion of that email is examined. The email address of the new email is compared to databases that contain information about the correct spelling and formatting of people's names, such as from a phone book, and of domain names, such as that used by an internet service provider (ISP) or a corporation.

The Cited Prior Art Does Not Anticipate the Claimed Invention

The MPEP and case law provide the following definition of anticipation for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 102:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

MPEP § 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)

The Examiner Has Not Established a *Prima Facie* Case of Anticipation

As noted above, the present claimed invention uses text mining and data mining methods on several attributes, including the email address as well as several other types of attributes, of the user's prior email and gives weightings to the results of the data mining. This facilitates predicting the intended address of an email based on the content of the email and the prior emailing tendencies of the user who creates the email and, thus, provides an efficient way to identify errors in an email address as well as a new, streamlined way of addressing email.

In contrast to the present invention, Quine does not examine a user's prior email, does not use text mining or data mining methods, only examines the email address of a single email and does not give any weightings to anything.

The Examiner does not point to any specific language and makes only the general statement that Figs. 5A-B, 6, 7 and 9 and paragraphs [0065] to [0075] of Quine disclose the entire invention recited in the independent claims of the present application, with the exception of the weighting of the analysis results. However, the cited passage discloses only that the email address of a newly sent email is compared to databases of the correct spelling of people's names and the correct formatting of known domain name formats. Nowhere does Quine make any mention of the user's prior email, as recited in the independent claims of the present application. Additionally, nowhere the does Quine make any mention of either text mining or data mining. Further, Quine discloses only that the recipient name and the recipient domain name of an email

are examined. Thus, the invention of Quine is nothing like use of text mining and data mining methods on several attributes, including the email address as well as several other types of attributes, of the user's prior email that is claimed in each independent claim of the present invention. For this reason, Quine does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27.

Additionally, the Examiner states that Fig. 9 and paragraphs [0074], [0075] and [0092] to [0095] of Quine disclose weighting the plurality of said single analysis results to provide a Data Mining Model adapted to offer at least one top favorite addressee proposal as a prediction result. However, the cited language and figure disclose only percentages of use of various email address formats within various domains. Nowhere in the cited passage or anywhere else does Quine disclose weightings given to the results of different analyses as in the present claimed invention. For this additional reason, Quine does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27.

Accordingly, each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23 and 27), and all claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Quine and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/670,638
Reply to Office Action of July 12, 2007

Amdt. dated October 12, 2007

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

October 12, 2007
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 Market Street
Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189